



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

profitably spent than in a further systematic treatment and review of these matters. The sentences for translation should, on the whole, be briefer. Six to eight lines is a useless length for any stage of high-school work.

The catechetical method of grammar instruction makes an odd impression on one at this day, but we might pardon it if the author had been more careful to slough off some of his classroom habits. It does not suit everyone to have his pupils learn grammatical terms like "infinitive with subject accusative construction" and "indirect question construction," or to read that "the hortatory subjunctive is a main clause used to denote, etc.," or to have "repeated action" and "completed action" (or even "complete time") spoken of constantly as if they were an exhaustive list of the possible tense-spheres.

Mistakes or misleading statements occur here and there. *Fines, -um* is misleading; *a mile* is not *milia passuum*, and *his army was conquered* is not *suus exercitus est victus*.

The author grudgingly "yields so far to present usage as to follow the old rule of marking long vowels in the penults and ultimas, and those only." "Hidden quantity" he has, as he says, altogether disregarded, i. e., has not marked the vowels before two consonants at all. The question of vowel-marking in an elementary Latin book is no longer an open one. But if one wishes to regard it so, he is in duty bound to choose between marking and not marking. The practice here adopted might be serviceable, if it were general, but, as things are, it is merely confusing.

There is not enough difference between the type of the exercises and that of the grammatical discussion, and the latter has a ragged and scattered appearance not inviting to the eye.

J. J. S.

Preparatory Latin Writer. By CHARLES E. BENNETT. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1905. Pp. 194. \$0.80.

The widespread and favorable recognition accorded to the same author's *Latin Composition*, published in 1896, to which the present book forms a companion volume, makes a lengthy notice of the *Latin Writer* unnecessary. The general plan of both books is the same. The number of lessons (forty-four), the order in which the constructions are treated (following strictly that of the author's Latin grammar), the grammatical references (to Bennett, Allen and Greenough, and Harkness—to the latest editions of the last two), the illustrative examples (adapted from Roman authors) and the remarks thereon, are identical in the two books. In the new book, however, the English sentences for translation into Latin are based upon Caesar and not, as in the *Latin Composition*, upon Cicero. The sentences are of about the same difficulty and exhibit the various constructions under treatment in about the same variety of forms. The author has met the demand for passages of "continuous prose"

by providing forty such exercises—about twenty-five more than the older book contains. The book is marked by the same accuracy of statement that characterizes the author's other works. There is much to praise and little to criticize. We might, however, have expected the remark on p. 56 to have been worded somewhat differently in view of the conclusions reached by George V. Edwards in his work on the *Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality* (New York, 1900); and since the phrase *multi ex se* rarely, if ever, occurs in classical prose it would probably best be omitted on p. 72. All in all, the book deserves to be highly recommended to teachers of Latin in secondary schools, who prefer the time-honored method of instruction in Latin composition, so well exemplified in this book and in that of Elisha Jones.

CLARENCE L. MEADER.

ANN ARBOR.

Latin Exercise Book. By A. I. DOTEY. New York: University Publishing Co. Part I, \$0.25; parts II, III, IV, \$0.20 each.

This series of notebooks, four in number, one for each of the first four books of Caesar's *Gallic War*, aims in the first place, according to the prefatory note, to guide the pupil in the preparation of his lesson, and in the second, to assist the teacher in securing definite recitations and systematic reviews. It consists of very helpful "Suggestive Questions and Notes" on each chapter, intended either to give the student direct assistance, or to call his attention by judicious questions to matters of importance to be found in his text or notes; of "Grammatical References" to be provided by the pupil for usually about thirty points of syntax taken from the chapter; of a blank column headed "Vocabulary," in which the pupil is to make a list of all new words and their meanings, and another column for additional notes taken in class. Last of all, there is a space, appropriately headed, for the inflection of some Latin word, to be written during the recitation period.

Aside from the practical difficulties which would suggest themselves to any teacher of Caesar in considering this plan, one cannot but think of the enormous amount of labor involved on the part of both teacher and pupil in operating with any degree of exactness a system of notebooks so elaborate as this. Yet when the great need, at that critical period, of some means of making both requirements and results more definite is considered, it seems ungrateful to criticize a plan so conscientiously worked out as this. The value of any such pedagogical device is, after all, in its suggestiveness; and while perhaps no teacher of any individuality would care to adopt this system of notes without modification, it might be used to advantage by almost any teacher.

J. RALEIGH NELSON.

LEWIS INSTITUTE,
Chicago.